and of nursing institutions, he thought they might administer a mild reproof to the Government. It would not affect their tenure of office.

The Chairman advised Mr. Parker Young if his acquaintances asked him whether the Central Midwives Board was doing any good to refer them to the Registrar-General's report. Since the passing of the Midwives Act mortality in childbirth had gone down with a run.

Lady Mabelle Egerton said she should oppose Mr. Parker Young's proposition, on the ground that it was too important to tack on to the end of a letter.

Miss Paget supported it, as she thought it advisable to take every opportunity of rubbing it in, and the rider was carried, the Chairman not voting, and Lady Mabelle Egerton voting against it.

A letter drafted by the Secretary, in reply to the midwife, was then considered in camera, and subsequently communicated to the Press. The reply informed Miss Taylor that her letter had been considered by the Board, and the Secretary wrote:

"I am directed to point out that the Board has no control over the medical profession, and, consequently, has no power to deal with the resolution of the Enfield Medico-Ethical Society.

"The proper course for you to adopt is to perform your duty in accordance with the directions laid down in the Rules of the Board. By so doing you will discharge the liability that attaches to you, and should anything untoward happen, as the result of the refusal of medical assistance, the responsibility will not rest upon you.

"As stated in my letter of July 28th, copies of your letter, and of that of the Enfield Medico-Ethical Society, were forwarded to the Privy Council. I now enclose a copy of a letter received in reply from the Clerk of the Council.

"I am to add that the Board regrets that the Government has not made provision for such cases."

The question which troubled the midwife, as set forth in her letter, was not the amount of her personal responsibility, but the very human one, which impresses a midwife brought face to face with suffering and urgent danger, whether her patient was to be allowed to die. The reply of the Central Midwives Board throws no light on this point.

Applications for Removal.

The names of twelve midwives were at their own request removed from the Roll.

Applications for Approval.

The application of Mr. J. D. Barrie, F.R.C.S., for approval as teacher was granted, and those of Mr. L. B. Betts, M.R.C.S., and Dr. C. Nixon Smith, *pro hâc vice*.

The following midwives were approved for the purpose of signing Forms III. and IV.:—S. Dottridge (No. 25872), E. A. L. Edwards (No. 66), C. Elliot (No. 8661), E. A. Hodgkinson (No. 1728), A. A. McMath (No. 25641), K. E. Shaw (No. 53), E. Stephens (No. 26939), E. M. Thorold (No. 30752), E. A. Jones (No. 21699) was approved *pro hâc vice*.

The Standing Committee reported that Doctors J. Bright Banister and R. Drummond Maxwell had presented a report as to the septic condition of one of the candidates at the August Examination. The Secretary further stated that, by direction of the Chairman, he had informed the candidate, who had failed at the Examination, that she would not be admitted to a future Examination, except on the production of a medical certificate, vouching that the unhealthy condition of her mouth no longer existed, and that her health was such as to make it possible for her to practise as a midwife without danger to her patients. The woman had now furnished a satisfactory medical certificate, and he had accordingly admitted her to the October examination.

This case affords a striking comment on our editorial remarks last week on the necessity of personal daintiness.

The Secretary presented a report on the August Examinations. The names of the successful candidates have already been published in these columns.

It is interesting to observe that the large London hospitals, with medical schools attached, sending up pupils for the Examination of the Board, are increasing. At the August Examination, the London Hospital sent up 5 candidates, one of whom failed; Guy's, the Middlesex, University College Hospital, 3 each; and St. Bartholomew's Hospital, 2; all of whom passed.

LEGAL MATTERS.

People are getting more and more chary of engaging nurses who are not insured under the Workmen's Compensation Act—which will, in time, make it almost impossible for nurses to work on their own responsibility in private nursing. This Act makes it almost compulsory for them to have an employer who can insure them, as no individual can insure herself.

A case of considerable importance to maternity nurses was recently decided at Wandsworth County Court by Judge Harrington. The applicant, Elizabeth Smith, sued Frederick Andrews for compensation in respect of personal injuries.

The applicant stated that she was engaged as maternity nurse to attend Mr. Andrews' wife. One day the applicant fell downstairs at the Andrews' house and cut her hand, which subsequently had to be amputated, owing to blood poisoning.

For the defence it was contended that the nurse was not a workman to whom the Compensation Act applied, because she was at the time of the alleged accident not in the employ of the respondent alone, being also engaged by a Mrs. Marks. It was also contended that the applicant's employment was only casual, and that the Act did not cover it.

The judge held that the employment was not casual, and that applicant was entitled to an award of 4s. 7d. a week.

previous page next page